

C. REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-15 and 18-26 are currently pending. Claims 1, 5, 10, 18, and 20 are currently amended. Claims 16 and 17 were previously canceled.

Lack of Anticipation under 35 USC § 102(e)

Claims 1-15 and 18-26 are not anticipated by Martin

The Office Action states that claims 1-15 and 18-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Martin et al. (US Publication 2003/0036975) (herein referred to as Martin). [Office Action, p. 4] Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 102(e). "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed Cir. 1987). Furthermore the reference must be an enabling disclosure of each and every element as set forth in the claim. *In re Hoecksmas*, 158 USPQ 596, 600 (CCPA 1968); *In re LeGrive*, 133 USPQ 365, 372 (CCPA 1962). Because Martin does not teach each and every element of claims 1-15 and 18-26 or enable each and every element of these claims, these claims are not anticipated, the rejection should be withdrawn, and the claims should be allowed.

Claims 1, 10, 18, and 20

Claim 1, which is representative of claims 10, 18, and 20 with regard to subject matter, currently reads as follows:

1. (Currently Amended) A method for creating a web page adapted to automatically reload selected frames of the web page in response to a trigger event, the method comprising:
defining a target frame within the web page to serve as a work area for performing programmed logic;

associating an action with the trigger event, the action having the target frame as a target; and
associating the programmed logic with the action, the programmed logic being adapted to specify the selected frames from among a plurality of frames of the web page other than the target frame and reload only the selected frames, regardless of a membership of the selected frames in framesets used to create the web page.

The Office Action rejects the element of associating the programmed logic with the action, the programmed logic being adapted to reload only the selected frames, regardless of a membership of the selected frames in framesets used to create the web page based on paragraphs 0059, 0060, 0061, and 0062 of Martin and the description that “the frames within the website are updated if the timer runs out and the Boolean flag has been set to true.” [Office Action, p. 4] Paragraph 0059 of Martin describes an option for refreshing a web page that “will only refresh the entire page if new information is present”, paragraphs 0060 and 0062 of Martin describe that a timer script checks whether a flag is set to “true” on the server side indicating new information is present and sets a value of a hidden updater frame to “true” if the server side flag is set to “true”, and paragraph 0061 of Martin describes that “the refresh variable is set to true only if the entire page is to be refreshed”. In addition, Applicants note that Martin describes a Javascript for performing this option which checks the value in the hidden frame and if the value is “true” the Javascript reloads the remainder of the page. *Martin*, paragraphs 0061 and 0062. Applicants respectfully assert that Martin does not, however, teach program logic which has a target frame as a work area for being performed, where that program logic is adapted to reload only selected frames of a web page separate from the target frame; Martin only teaches determining, based on an updater frame code, whether to refresh an entire page. *Martin*, paragraph 0061. In contrast, claims 1, 10, 18, and 20 clearly teach a web page adapted to automatically reload only selected frames of a web page and therefore not to reload all the frames of the web page. Therefore, because Martin’s updater object for determining whether to refresh an entire web page does not teach logic adapted to reload only selected frames, Martin does not

teach each and every element of claims 1, 10, 18, and 20, and the claims should be allowed.

In addition, while Applicants respectfully assert that it is clear that claims 1, 10, 18, and 20 teach only reloading a selection, and not all of the frames, other than the target frame, Applicants amend claims 1, 10, 18, and 20 to clarify that the programmed logic is adapted both to select the selected frames from among the plurality of frames other than the target frame and to reload only the selected frames within the web page. Applicants respectfully assert that Martin clearly does not teach programmed logic that selects only a selection of frames for updating from among all the frames of a web page other than the target frame and then reloads only the selected frames. Further, Applicants respectfully note that the specification of the present invention makes it clear that the focus of the invention is reloading selected, but not all, frames regardless of the membership of the selected frames in framesets throughout, and for example, in paragraphs 0035, 0037, 0039, 0040, 0044 and Figure 2 and Figure 3 and that the specification also describes the programmed logic for specifying the selected frames in paragraphs 0013, 0037, 0039, 0041, and 0044. In addition, Applicants respectfully note that the specification of the present invention makes it clear that the “selected frames” are frames other than the separate defined target frame throughout, and for example, in paragraphs 0032 and 0033 and Figure 2 and Figure 3. Because the specification clearly teaches the amended elements of claims 1, 10, 18, and 20, no new matter is added through the amendments to the claims.

Claims 2-9, 11-15, 19, and 21-26

As to claims 2-9, 11-15, 19, and 21-26, Applicants respectfully assert that because claims 2-9, 11-15, 19, and 21-26 are dependent upon allowable claims 1, 10, 18, and 20, then claims 2-9, 11-15, 19, and 21-26 are also allowable by virtue of the dependency.

In addition, as to claims 3, 12, and 26 Applicants respectfully assert that Martin does not teach defining the target frame as a frame having a null dimension and therefore Martin does not teach each and every element of claim 3. The Office Action cites paragraphs 0059 and 0060 of Martin as reading on the claimed element of defining the target frame as a frame having a null dimension and as describing “the hidden updater frame is hidden from the user so it has null dimensions.” [Office Action, p. 5] In particular, Applicants note that Martin describes that “frames may be visible or invisible to the end user” and that in an example there is one frame that will be invisible from the end user. *Martin*, paragraph 0059. Martin does not, however, provide any enabling embodiment of a hidden frame. In addition, Martin does not teach or enable a frame of null dimensions. In contrast, paragraphs 0032, 0033 and Figure 3 of the present invention provide multiple enabling examples of multiple types of target frames, including multiple enabling embodiments of a frame that is not visible to the end user, including a target frame defined having a null dimension as claimed in claims 3, 12, and 26. Martin’s mere reference to a hidden frame does not enable a frame having a null dimension. Therefore, because Martin does not teach or enable each and every element of claims 3, 12, and 26, Martin does not anticipate claims 3, 12, and 26 and the claims should be allowed.

In addition, as to claims 4 and 13, Applicants respectfully assert that Martin does not teach a target frame of null dimensions defined as a frame of 0 rows and 0 columns at an edge of the web page. Again, the Office Action cites paragraphs 0059 and 0060 of Martin as reading on the claimed element of defining the target frame as a frame of 0 rows and 0 columns at an edge of the web page and as describing “the hidden updater frame is hidden so it has 0 rows and 0 columns.” [Office Action, p. 5] Martin’s description of a hidden frame does not teach or enable a frame of 0 rows and 0 columns. In addition, Martin’s description of a hidden frame does not teach or enable a frame defined at the edge of a web page. Therefore, because Martin does not teach or

enable any of the elements of claims 4 and 13, Martin does not anticipate claims 4 and 13 and the claims should be allowed.

In addition, as to claim 5, Applicants respectfully assert that Martin does not teach each and every element of claim 5 because Martin does not teach a first frameset tag which partitions the web page into the main frameset of frames and separately the target frame. Applicants note that claim 5 is amended to clarify that the first frameset tag is used to partition the web page into a main frameset comprising the plurality of frames and separately the target frame having the null dimension. The specification describes the first frameset with the work area target frame separated from the main frameset throughout, and for example, in paragraphs 0012 and 0032. The Office Action cites paragraphs 0059 and 0060 as reading the claimed element of using a first frameset tag in the web page to partition the web page into a main frameset comprising the plurality of frames, and separately the target frame having the null dimension.

[Office Action, pp. 5-6] Paragraph 0059 of Martin describes that a frameset may be used and states that “a frameset allows a web page to be broken into several areas (frames), each containing its own web page.” Applicants respectfully assert that Martin merely describes that a webpage may be defined by a frameset of frames. Martin does not, however, teach defining a frameset tag and in particular Martin does not teach a frameset tag that partitions the web page into another, main frameset and the target frame. Therefore, because Martin does not teach using a first frameset tag in the web page to partition the web page into a main frameset and a separate target frame, Martin does not teach each and every element of claim 5 and the claim should be allowed.

In addition, as to claim 7, Applicants respectfully assert that Martin does not teach each and every element of claim 7 because Martin does not teach accessing server-side functions that return the programmed logic for directing client-side reloading of only the selected frames. Applicants note that Martin describes a server with a flag set to either “false” or “true” and the client side checking the status of the flag. Martin, paragraphs 0060 and 0062. Checking the status of a flag at a server side does not

teach the server-side function returning programmed logic. Further, in particular, checking the status of a flag at a server side as described in Martin does not teach returning programmed logic from the server-side to the client for directing client-side reloading of only the selected frames as claimed in claim 7. Therefore, because Martin does not teach each and every element of claim 7, claim 7 is not anticipated and should be allowed.

Conclusion

Applicants note the citation of pertinent prior art cited by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and the allowance of the current pending claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner feels that the pending claims could be allowed with minor changes, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss an Examiner's Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Amy J. Pattillo, Reg. No. 46,983/
AMY J. PATTILLO
Registration No. 46,983
P.O. BOX 161327
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78716
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS
Telephone: 512-402-9820
Facsimile: 512-306-0417